

starving. Its employment promotes among those who use it a hardening of the heart which is destructive of the Christian values, values which include mercy and compassion, and for which this country claims to be fighting. If this policy is continued, the result to the world will be incalculable spiritual and moral loss. We know from the experience of previous wars that such a policy makes it far harder to build a new world; and for the men and women who were starved as children, or watched the starvation of their children, to help in building it. We recognize that in the introduction of food, serious political and technical difficulties are involved, but experience during and since the last war shows that these can be overcome. This has already been done in part in respect of Greece. The Religious Society of Friends believes therefore that it is urgently necessary to find means of permitting the entry into the countries of Europe at present closed by the blockade of at least such food and clothing as are essential for the maintenance and growth of child life, even if this involves a lessening of our own supplies."

## Bombers Over Tokyo

**N**O NEWS since Pearl Harbor has sent such a thrill of excitement through the nation as was caused when Tokyo broadcast word that American planes had bombed that city, Yokohama, Kobe, and Nagoya. Up to that moment the American people had found the war almost entirely a test in bearing up under defeats. The attempts to magnify minor naval actions and the shelling of small atolls into important victories had utterly failed to rouse them. The exaggerated interpretation imparted to such incidents had been too palpable. Pearl Harbor, Wake, Guam, Manila, the Java straits, Bataan—these were the names which had become fixed in the American mind, and these were all defeats. Would there never come news of another kind?

Perhaps it was the very fact that the attack on Tokyo came so soon after the surrender of Bataan that made it seem so rousing an achievement in American eyes. "This," cried a representative midwestern paper like the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, "is the electrifying news for which the people of the United Nations have been eagerly hoping." Yet beyond the contrast to the evil tidings from Bataan, there was a deeper reason why the country hailed the report of these bombings with such enthusiasm. If defeating Japan involved retaking, one by one, the islands and the mainland bases all the way back from Australia to Hongkong, then there was no prospect ahead but long years of fighting and a staggering toll of death. But if the war could be carried to the heart of the Japanese empire by air, then the smashing of production centers might speedily bring victory.

Long before the actual outbreak of hostilities, magazine articles and roving lecturers had filled the minds of Americans with lurid pictures of what would happen, in case of war, to the flimsy cities of Japan. At that time, to be sure, the prophets were expecting that these holocausts

would be spread by American bombers operating from the Philippines, or from the decks of carriers protected by great fleets plowing majestically westward from Hawaii. These expected American advantages have been wiped out by the bitter realities of the war. But the Japanese cities are still there, with their wooden houses still divided by paper screens. They are still the same vast, sprawling fire-traps revealed at Tokyo and Yokohama in the great earthquake of 1923. If Germany hoped to win by knocking out London or the cities of the Midlands, if England hoped to win by bombing the Ruhr and the Rhineland, what might not be accomplished by raining fire and high explosives on the matchwood cities of Japan?

That is the question which every amateur strategist in America has been asking ever since the day war was declared. The air raid on Tokyo and its three sister cities is a first indication that this question may soon be answered. To be sure, the results of this first raid are unknown. The Japanese, as might be expected, try to minimize them. They insist that no military damage was done; that only civilian objectives were hit. But such targets as those four great cities can hardly have got off lightly. And if they did, what has been done once can be done again, and if necessary again and again and again until all these cities have been leveled to the ground, until all their factories are a mass of twisted steel and ruined machinery, until all the homes of all the workers in those factories have gone up in flames, until all Japan is pounded into helpless rubble.

All this is, of course, the military way of looking at the bombing of Tokyo. And in war what other way is there in which to look than the military way? Certainly the Japanese have least reason of any nation to complain if the United States uses its air forces to blast their cities. Anyone who has seen the newsreels knows what Japanese bombers have done to Shanghai, to Changsha, to Chungking. Assuredly they will do the same to San Francisco, to Los Angeles, to Seattle if they can. So much is this to be taken for granted in warfare that the day after Tokyo was bombed OCD Commissioner Landis warned the block captains in Chicago to be on the alert against reprisal raids. It is simply the fortune of war, and not any difference in the methods by which the nations are fighting, which is responsible for the fact that American planes have begun to drop bombs on Japanese cities while Japanese generals have to be content with wishing that their planes could be dropping bombs on American cities.

Nevertheless, there were undoubtedly thousands—yes, millions—of Americans who heard of the bombing of Tokyo with anything but rejoicing. Try to reason about it as they might, they turned away from the newspaper headlines or the radio's feverish bulletins with heavy hearts. Many of them sought to satisfy themselves with reminders of "military necessity." But that sickish feeling at the pit of the stomach, that irrepressible beating of forbidden thoughts at the base of the brain, persisted. What of the people in those tinder-box houses? What of the simple old women, many of them already bowed before the shrines which hold the white boxes filled with the ashes of their soldier sons? What of the children, perhaps caught clacking along the streets in their doll-like

limonos  
Sagawa,  
has fallen  
China?

Question  
even into  
is the A  
less destru  
civilian p  
ary busin  
and we ca  
blows we  
faltering  
more the  
"We can  
may inju  
us. It is  
home wi  
themselves

Yes, at  
the ques  
are the  
wrestling  
tensity i  
profess  
tions w  
rest.

Chris  
these  
such as  
ing. Th  
Christia  
single  
in this  
missible  
his pap

Are  
thing  
busin  
to me  
it is  
main  
is w  
viol  
purp  
sold  
if th  
cause  
mit

To D  
Chris  
infect  
But  
dition  
ways  
degre  
altitu  
can  
Eng  
he w  
look  
don



kimonos? What if one of those bombs had fallen on Kagawa, who lives in Tokyo, as many a Japanese bomb has fallen on faithful and peace-loving Christians in China?

Questions of that kind seem to have found their way even into the editorial chambers of such a staid newspaper as the *New York Times*. "In this attack we shall doubtless destroy," it admits, "many civilian lives and much civilian property. It is an unhappy business, but it is necessary business; for it is an inescapable part of total war, and we cannot and will not shrink from giving the heaviest blows we can deliver." Then, as if to reinforce a suddenly faltering resolution, the editor of the *Times* catalogues once more the infamies of the Japanese militarists and declares: "We cannot soften our blows because we fear that they may injure Japanese who are not actually in arms against us. It is no hypocrisy to say that we must press the attack home with all our force in the interest of these Japanese themselves."

Yes, all that the *Times* says about total war is true. But the questions with which its editor was obviously wrestling are the questions with which millions of the rest of us are wrestling. They are questions which rise with especial tensivity in the minds of thoughtful men and women who profess and call themselves Christians. And they are questions which reflections about total war will not lay to rest.

Christians in Great Britain have been wrestling with these same questions ever since aerial bombing assumed such an important role in the warfare their nation is waging. That great Christian soul, Dr. J. H. Oldham, whose *Christian News-Letter* has done more than any other single agency to try to discover a rationale for Christians in this bitter hour, sought to draw a line between permissible and forbidden kinds of bombing in an issue of his paper published last October:

Are bombing and machine-gunning to be directed to "everything moving"? Children, for example? Or is this a "dirty business" with which we may not soil our hands? That seems to me the crucial issue. . . . The justification of this war is that it is in essence a large-scale police measure—an attempt to maintain a true order against anarchy and tyranny. But if that is what it really is, then, as in all police measures, greater violence must not be used than is necessary to achieve the purpose in view. To go beyond that is murder. Policemen and soldiers can in the exercise of their calling commit murder and, if they do, are liable to punishment. Neither the justice of our cause nor the crimes of our enemies are a justification for committing murder.

To Dr. Oldham bombing becomes something which the Christian cannot defend when it passes into "the immoral infliction of indiscriminate and meaningless slaughter."

But the trouble is that actual bombing, under the conditions which warfare imposes upon the aviator, must always be to a considerable degree indiscriminate. To what degree can a flyer operating at, say, twenty thousand feet altitude pick his targets? William L. White, the American correspondent, put that question to R.A.F. pilots in England about a year ago. One of them told him that if he would drop an ordinary sized book at his feet and then look down at it he would see what, approximately, London looks like to the crew of a bomber when viewed from

the heights at which the bombers are usually forced to fly in clear weather. The difficulty of picking targets at night is of course even greater. Under such circumstances, what becomes of the effort to draw a line between discriminate and indiscriminate bombing? No, the Christian mind can find slight reassurance here. In actual war it is idle to try to put a check upon the way in which weapons are used. If we fight at all, we fight all out. And fighting all out will involve many things which will drive the introspective mind and the kindly spirit into long nights of harassed thought.

It is all a part of the hell of war. So long as we are in war we are in hell. And here we can only commit to the mercy of God those upon whom the bombs may fall, and those who release them toward a scarcely seen mark, and not least of all those of us who have willed that they shall be released.

## Citizens or Subjects?

WHEN the war is over, Americans may discover that in the early months of the conflict democracy received its most staggering blows in their own country and not at Pearl Harbor or on Bataan. Actions taken under the guise of military necessity have already deprived numbers of the citizens of this democracy of their constitutionally guaranteed equality before the law. Essential democratic rights have been infringed and racial distinctions placed above law. A principle of discrimination has been invoked which will, if allowed to stand, divide our citizenship into classes and bring into question the basic presuppositions on which this nation was founded.

As this is written, more than one hundred thousand persons are being moved from their homes in the Pacific coast states to concentration camps in the interior. More than one-half of this number are American citizens. They were born in this country and have never lived in any other. They owe allegiance to no other nation. They speak our language, have been educated in our schools, accept our customs, pay taxes, vote and render military service. Until recently there was never any question that they were entitled to the exercise of the full rights of citizenship under the Constitution. In its fifth and its fourteenth amendments, that Constitution provides that "no person may be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law."

Now, without resort to established legal procedures and without a proclamation of martial law which would suspend those processes, these citizens are being deprived of liberty and are suffering the loss of property. A presidential order authorizing military commanders to remove from defense areas any person whose presence is deemed by them inimical to defense has been used as authority for the compulsory evacuation of all persons of Japanese descent from a great zone running the length of the Pacific coast. No hearings or other procedure under the law are available to these tens of thousands of citizens to protect them from the loss of their liberty. They are being treated